

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

BY

WINTHROP E. STONE

President of Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

*(From Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Annual Convention of
the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and
Experiment Stations, Atlanta, Ga.,
Nov. 13-15, 1912).*

BURLINGTON:
FREE PRESS PRINTING COMPANY,
1912.

transfer
JAN 10 1919

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

BY

WINTHROP E. STONE

President of Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

*(From Proceedings of the Twenty-sixth Annual Convention of
the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and
Experiment Stations, Atlanta, Ga.,
Nov. 13-15, 1912).*

BURLINGTON:
FREE PRESS PRINTING COMPANY,
1912.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

By WINTHROP E. STONE

The first duty of one who has received a high appointment at the hands of his fellows is to express grateful appreciation of the honor conferred; the second is to discharge the duties and responsibilities assigned to him, with the single purpose of serving to the best of his ability those who have reposed confidence in him. With these mingled desires I come to take up the office which has been made illustrious by a long list of distinguished and able leaders, realizing as never before the great significance of this association and the institutions of which it is composed. To have some share in the work of the American agricultural colleges and experiment stations is an honor and a responsibility which should inspire any man to his best effort. It is a gratifying thought that the great army of officers, teachers, and investigators connected with these institutions are more than ordinarily imbued with this altruistic spirit of service and responsibility and enjoy an unusual pride in the cause in which they strive. The very fact of the common origin and functions of our colleges and stations is a connecting bond between the members of their personnel. One cannot attend the meetings of this association year after year without receiving a profound impression of the earnestness, high mindedness and spirit of fine fellowship among its members. This spirit arises perhaps from the very nature of their duties in a cause which is necessarily unselfish and democratic. The agricultural colleges and experiment stations of America are to be congratulated upon their good works and their lofty aims.

In the years through which we now are passing almost every day is a semi-centenary of some stirring event in the great civil conflict which, a generation since, rent the Nation in twain. As time separates us from those days, their immediate significance dwindles in the long perspective of years and we estimate their true importance in the development to which they gave impulse, rather than in the events themselves at that time. Not the battles but the effects resulting from them, interest us today.

Applying this same method of appraisal to another series of contemporaneous events, we are amazed by contrast to contemplate the consequences of what was, fifty years ago, an act of little apparent importance but which was potentially epoch-making in the history of our country.

It was the very essence of incongruity that amid the din of fierce battles, in an atmosphere surcharged with the war spirit, there should have been inaugurated one of the greatest educational projects which our country or any other has ever known.

Thus it is that coincident with the anniversaries of great battles, we celebrate the birthday of a new educational and industrial force; the fiftieth anniversary of the passage and approval of the famous Morrill act and the foundation of the remarkable group of American agricultural and mechanical colleges and experiment stations.

Contemporaneous with this event was the establishment of the United States Department of Agriculture, and for fifty years these two agencies have been exerting with increasing efficiency a tremendous influence upon the agriculture of the country.

It is to be regretted that a more formal and appropriate observance of this significant anniversary was impracticable. The occasion and the theme are worthy of general celebration by all who have regard for genuine national progress.

But the program prepared for this convention is rich in anniversary subjects and it is for me only to touch briefly upon the

topic, as indeed I cannot well refrain from doing. Since anniversaries are always retrospective in sentiment, it may not be out of place to recall that our institutions have not always basked in the warmth of popularity as they now seem to do. Not always were their coffers overflowing, nor their farmer constituents eager to sit beneath the droppings of the sanctuary. Echoes as to the futility of "book farming" have scarcely yet died away and it is well for us to remember in days of prosperity the small beginnings, the hard struggles and the discouraging experiences through which all of our institutions have come. Our birthday and our development have been coincident with the pain and the progress of the nation.

After fifty years of existence a reasonable family pride is excusable and we certainly have cause for gratification in the growth and achievements of the group of institutions which were born out of the confusion of 1862. Therefore, I deem it not inappropriate on this occasion to refer to these facts. In 1911 there were 67 educational institutions receiving the benefits of the Morrill act of 1862, operating in all of the states and territories except Alaska. These institutions possess property of the aggregate value of over one hundred and twenty million dollars; their annual incomes amount to over twenty-two million dollars; their permanent endowment and equipment was increased during the year by over five million dollars; 7,342 persons were engaged as teachers, investigators or extension workers; 54,000 students were in attendance and hundreds of thousands of other persons received some degree of instruction; 7,577 students were graduated; while the total number of graduates since the institutions were organized is 90,512. For the establishment and maintenance of these colleges the Federal Government has made large donations. The original land grants amounted to over eighteen million dollars and under the "second" Morrill act and the Nelson act, the total disbursements from the federal treasury now amount to over twenty million dollars. Fifty experiment stations, with one or two exceptions organically connected with the land grant colleges, receive benefits of the Hatch act of 1887. These institutions enjoy an annual income of over three and one-half millions of dollars, employ 1,567 persons in the work of administration and investigation, and publish annually 566 reports, bulletins and circulars, which are distributed free to over one million addresses.

These statistics constitute the barest framework on which to base an estimate of the institutions and are scarcely indicative of their importance, their influence, and their achievements. One must know their history to appreciate their vigor and strength; must come in touch with the quality and character of their work; must grasp their scope and their relation to the life of the people in order to comprehend their place in the educational world.

The establishment of these institutions has brought the application of scientific principles into the commonest occupations; emphasized the democracy of education; established the status of tax supported institutions of higher learning; and more than any other cause, contributed to the development of the new education in America. Now at the end of fifty years, the land grant colleges with the experiment stations and the departments of agricultural extension, constitute the most unique, useful, appreciated, and popular group of educational institutions in the country.

Apologies are due for imposing upon your patience by this recital of well-known facts and these trite observations, but it seemed worth while to bring distinctly before the convention a realization of the magnitude and importance of the institutions here represented. We are all deeply absorbed in our local situations and it is doubtful if we have taken occasion to obtain a proper conception of our institutions as a class, as a group of closely related units. Do we stop to consider in any given contingency that we should act not solely with reference to our individual needs but to some extent with regard to policies affecting all of our institutions as a group? We

ought to be deeply concerned in establishing common policies for the future bearing upon our many relations to the State and to each other and to other educational agencies and aims, for the sake of imparting permanency, character and individuality to our institutions as a class. We should with common purpose and united energies seek to develop the highest type of an institution in our field in the conviction that the best interests of the single institutions will be promoted by that which strengthens the group and raises the type.

Each college and station has its peculiar problems and difficulties which it must meet and solve unaided, but on the other hand we have problems, dangers, and enterprises in common, toward which we should seek to present a united attitude and be guided by a common policy. For instance, we sustain certain close relations to the Federal Government, and to the Department of Agriculture. We are all interested in proposed federal legislation and often times state legislation relates to matters in which we are all concerned. Our educational and scientific efforts are brought sharply into contrast with those of other institutions and we should have common concern that they do not suffer by comparison. We are peculiarly exposed to criticism, to popular favor or disfavor. If one institution makes a mistake we all suffer in public confidence. If one is threatened, all watch the outcome with deep interest. In all of these matters, therefore, it behooves us to recognize certain guiding principles; certain standards and certain policies. The important thing is that our ideas of community interest be strengthened, not alone for mutual protection or advantage, but the better to meet the very great responsibilities increasingly impending.

The original purpose of this association was to be a forum for the discussion of general questions of administration and to formulate general policies for the guidance of its members. Beyond a doubt the success of our institutions is largely due to the leadership and guidance of this organization. Now with its larger membership and with their greater diversity of interests, it becomes increasingly difficult to pursue the unity of purpose which characterized our institutions in the early days, while the same causes increase the dangers of individual independence and isolation.

The land grant colleges are no longer inconspicuous and unimportant. In most states they are not only the authority on agricultural and related industrial matters, but they have large influence educationally. Their responsibilities are, therefore, very great and their attitude or action of vast significance in their respective communities. It is, therefore, of first importance that we take wise counsel on matters of general interest for which there is as yet no precedent or law. Every decision, every action taken by our institutions is of far-reaching importance either to the public or to their own future.

It seems, therefore, appropriate on this occasion to refer to some recent developments in the field which our institutions occupy, toward which our attitude and general policy should be well defined.

First among these are questions concerning the relations between the land grant colleges and other educational institutions and agencies.

From the fact that the fundamental ideas underlying the land grant colleges were new and radical they have been compelled from the first to strive against the conservative attitude of the older and well established institutions. This opposition has been expressed in various forms, some of which have disappeared while others are just now coming into evidence. Every agricultural college, except possibly some of those more recently established in the prosperous western states, experienced in its early history an attitude of indifference, mistrust, and general lack of confidence. Farmers did not believe in their principles. Educators regarded them as outside the sphere of educational recognition, and these attitudes were reflected by the general public. The experiment stations in their turn, although com-

ing after the barriers of prejudice had been in part broken down, were for a time received with scant confidence by either the public or by scientific men.

I well remember the social toboggan slide upon which I embarked and which speedily set up a gulf between myself and schoolday comrades because I enrolled in the "Aggie" college and they in a more reputable classical institution. Professors in the agricultural colleges, I can also imagine, winced under the same discrimination. Now one recalls that phase of the history of our colleges with good humored interest in the great change which has followed. The agricultural colleges have demonstrated their claim to an honorable place in the educational field. The exponent of book farming has demonstrated to the farmer conclusively that two and two make four. The question of recognition has been settled on the only possible basis, viz., of merit. Our colleges are today receiving about what they deserve in the way of public confidence and recognition and are not likely again to experience the conditions which obtained during the forty years following their establishment.

As soon as the colleges began to emerge from the obscurity of their early years and began to acquire prestige and public confidence; when as a result the tide of students began to set toward them and public treasuries yielded ever so slightly to their support, then a new opposition developed on the part of the older educational institutions who were possibly a little apprehensive concerning the vigor and promise of their new competitors. Doubtless every agricultural college, especially in the older states, has felt earlier or later the unfriendly attitude of other colleges. One grieves a little that the exponents of the higher intellectual life should ever lapse into such unethical acts, but history cannot be effaced. In some of the states the echoes of conflict between the so-called state and non-state schools has scarcely yet died away. But this opposition has been overcome and the question of the right or the expediency of the State to maintain the higher education will not again be seriously discussed.

That quarrels should occur between churches or between colleges is a disagreeable but necessary admission. We might expect better things, but quarrels do grow out of jealousies or ill-balanced ambitions and some of the most regrettable occurrences of this kind have arisen between tax supported institutions in the same State. As is well known, in a number of states the land grant colleges and the state university are organized as separate institutions. Almost invariably under these conditions friction has arisen and the taxpayer has been entertained as well as called upon to settle the bills for an attenuated family row. The utter futility of this has been completely demonstrated. There is no surer way to destroy public confidence, to demoralize the work of faculties and students, and to minimize their usefulness to the community, than for sister state institutions to be flying at each others' throats, importuning the legislature, dividing the public into partisan camps, and expending their energies in destructive rather than constructive effort. Some recent examples of this sort are conspicuously unfortunate. In one or two states the harvest of these indiscretions is now being garnered. In others the mills of the gods are still grinding. There can be but one outcome to such a course and that is a positive loss to the institutions and a setback to educational progress in the State. The remedy seems quite simple. In the light of experience one would say now that it would probably have been better to unite these tax supported institutions at the beginning. This is now impossible. The next thing is, therefore, to make the most of the situation. In states where the land grant college and state university are separated, no time should be lost by their authorities in arriving at a mutual understanding as to the respective fields they are to occupy, always with reference to public welfare. Duplication of effort should be avoided for the sake of economy as well as harmony, and then, good faith should be kept. The ideal

adjustment between two such institutions is that which secures to the State by co-ordination of both, the full range of instruction otherwise given in a single state university without unnecessary duplication. To the land grant college should go all teaching of technology and applied science, to the state university, instruction in liberal arts and the professions of law and medicine.

Failure to mutually agree upon some such adjustment will bring inevitably the interference of legislatures, than which, so far as meddling with the curriculum goes, nothing could be more unfortunate. The method of appointing one board of supervisors or regents over separate institutions, particularly if given power to meddle with the internal administration of the institution, is intolerable. It is destructive of the spirit, the individuality, and the freedom so necessary to the life and progress of an educational institution. No argument or warning in this matter can be more convincing than the experiences of those states where the jealousies and bickerings of sister institutions have persisted to their logical conclusion.

It is perhaps not necessary to attempt a definite enumeration of the content of the curriculum of a land grant college. If this could have been done with foresight and authority twenty-five years ago, it would have averted a deal of trouble in some instances. More than one attempt has been made by those unfriendly to our institutions, to crystallize an interpretation of the Morrill act to the effect that the land grant colleges were intended to be of secondary grade—a kind of industrial and trade school; that agricultural instruction is *per se* of this order and that the term "mechanic arts" means trade and vocational training rather than engineering. This suggestion is usually made when it is desired to remove engineering departments from the land grant college to the state university. I can find neither in the law nor in the facts any warrant for this assumption. Engineering instruction has found its greatest growth and development in the land grant institutions. They represent at this time the preponderance of effort in this field. It is strained and artificial to claim that our colleges are illegally occupying a field which they have cultivated so successfully and acceptably.

It is significant that this fallacious notion that our colleges are intended to be of inferior grade or in some way of different scholastic standards than other institutions of higher learning, is reflected in the attitude of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which apparently clings to the view that there is something inherently crude and unintellectual in agriculture as a subject of study or scientific investigation and continues to deny to the agricultural colleges and agricultural departments of the state universities, as a class, the benefits of the retiring allowance.

All of these difficulties, the struggle for recognition, the opposition of competing institutions, the attempts to segregate the colleges in an inferior class, were but to be expected under the circumstances. They constitute real obstacles and hindrances to progress in many cases. They might have been to a large degree averted by concerted and positive action of the institutions in formulating their policies with regard to those things and defining their positions in advance.

Just now it is proposed to remove from the Iowa Agricultural College to the Iowa State University, its course leading to a degree in general science and its courses in home economics. The step is one of most vital interest to every institution similarly situated. If this is accepted without protest, it is quite certain that similar movements will be inaugurated in other states without delay. Again the whole question of what is meant by "mechanic arts" and the right of our institutions to maintain departments of engineering, which is still being agitated, ought not to go begging for support from this association. This is also true of the broad general question of the place of the agricultural college in the educational world now brought to an issue by the position of the Carnegie Foundation.

From the address of your last president I take the liberty of quoting on this point. Said he in his strong plea for a high and well-rounded plan of educational effort in our colleges:

"There are those, doubtless, who believe that these institutions, supported by public funds should stand in especially close relation to the people and that in order to do the work for which they were organized they should establish a low grade of admission, occupy a secondary place in our educational scheme, adhere closely to instruction of an ultra-vocational character and engage extensively in agricultural propaganda, leaving to the older colleges and universities the severer training that is required in preparing men and women for the higher ranges of thought and activity. It is to be hoped that if we have in any measure adopted this policy we shall move away from it as rapidly as circumstances will permit."

Do we not in passively accepting the consequences of such a classification commit ourselves in the public estimate to such a relative position? These things to which I refer have been the occasion of grave crises in the history of many of our colleges. Some are still threatened by these contentions. I raise the question for the consideration of the association, if it is not a proper function, not to say a duty, on its part to speak some authoritative words on the general topic of the scope and standards of the agricultural colleges.

I pass now to the discussion of a second situation which closely concerns our institutions.

Within a few years we have entered upon a new period of development. The teachings of the colleges and stations have taken root and now begin to bear fruit. Farmers now look confidently toward our institutions for advice and guidance in small things as well as great. The mail bags and letter files testify to our popularity and in response to this new evidence of public confidence we are entering upon a policy of expansion and extension. To instruct students in residence, to investigate and publish are now only a part of the functions of college and station. Demonstration, extension, and propaganda are the conspicuous activities of our institutions today. The movement is of course self-propagating. The more it is done the greater the popular demand for it.

The extraordinary general interest in everything pertaining to agriculture is remarkable. It would constitute an interesting psychological study. It almost amounts to a popular movement and the significant thing about it is the unlimited confidence shown in "scientific agriculture" so-called. In this is much of peculiar importance to our institutions. To official boards and executives who have experienced the years of famine this change of public sentiment is a great relief. In many other respects it is fraught with dangers. One of these is the reflex effect upon the personnel of our institutions. Popularity is an intoxicating experience. It is not easy to deny the appeals from one's constituents for multifarious service. The feeling that one is useful to the public is gratifying. The result of this upon our institutions is likely to be a weakening and letting down of the quality of its instruction and research. The enormous volume and extent of the demands made upon the time, energy and resources of the colleges and stations is sufficient to paralyze the forces for teaching and investigation, quite apart from the subtle temptation to neglect them for the more popular thing. Particularly is this a dangerous influence upon our young men, who are already inclined to give too much weight to material prizes and popular recognition as over against the hard discipline and austere rewards of application in the laboratory and class room.

Another danger lies in the tendency to divert the support derived from public taxation to these popular enterprises to the neglect and injury of the permanent and more valuable work of the institution. The danger of over-popular interest lies therefore not merely in its own exaggeration which is sure to be followed by a reaction, but also in its demoralizing influence upon the morals and standards of our

institutions and, further, in the distortion of public appreciation and public support of these permanent functions. I would not be misunderstood as depreciating the value of extension work. The present popular awakening is one of the most encouraging movements of the day. It is of immense importance; so much so that it demands the wisest guidance in order that it may be given true and not false direction; that it may find its right place and relation in the organization of our institutions. It should have its own budget, staff, and equipment, fully supplied to meet the demand in order that the regular departments of instruction and investigation shall not be diminished in efficiency. We should guard jealously our scientific workers and teachers from the distractions of extension enterprises. It is most certain that the future will demand more and more of our institutions; that much of the present extension work will prove only ephemeral; that the demand will be for more thorough teaching, serious investigations, and for a service which eventually can only be supplied by those who labor in the laboratory and class room rather than on the lecture platform. To prepare for this time we must increase rather than diminish the substantial scientific work in our stations and sound teaching in our colleges as the reserve from which extension activities must always draw their inspiration and material.

Another important result of this great increase of popular interest in agriculture bears upon the public relations of our institutions. It finds expression in the eager desire of the politician, the promotor, the man with the axe to grind, the man with something to sell, and all of those various schemers and persons who are awaiting the approach of the proverbial band wagon to enjoy its facilities of transportation. Recognizing the prestige of anything which, in the name of agriculture, appeals to the public under the guise of science or education, these schemers clothe their projects in the semblance of scientific or educational propaganda, offering themselves or their wares in the interest of the "new agriculture." Scarcely a day passes which does not bring to light some new scheme, legislative, commercial, philanthropic, or otherwise, which seeks advancement by utilizing popular interest. Some of these are beneficent, some are fraudulent, some represent commendable motives but misguided plans, most of them are likely because of selfish underlying motives to mislead the public, to end in disappointment and eventually bring discredit upon all efforts to promote permanent and rational progress. The public has not learned to discriminate between the spurious and the genuine; it does not yet understand that the one safe source of instruction in agricultural science is the college and station; that the safe guides in these matters are those in the employ of public institutions who have nothing to exploit and no selfish interest to serve. These schemes frequently win public support and when the station or college are unable to cooperate or approve, a situation is created which is embarrassing and sometimes threatening. The crop of proposed legislation upon agricultural and vocational education submitted to federal and state legislatures illustrates this situation. Much of it ill considered, too radical, and of doubtful expediency, it finds ready support from those who hope to mend their political fences with its manifold promises or whose experiences do not enable them to fathom its fallacies.

As a matter of general policy there seems only one course for our institutions to follow, viz., to seek constantly to educate our constituents to an intelligent discrimination in these matters; to establish a degree of confidence in the colleges and stations which accept their judgment as conclusive; to stand only for conservative legislation on new and untried projects and to fearlessly oppose all that is not genuine and which has not for its prime motive the real advancement of the art and science of agriculture. The exploitation of the interest in agricultural science for private ends merits the firm and open opposition of all the land grant institutions.

I have already referred to the birth and growth of the United States Department of Agriculture, co-existent with the land grant colleges and, like them, achieving in its fifty years of existence an immense prestige and usefulness. No one may deny to it and to its able corps of officers and scientists, credit for a great and useful work. Charged as it is under the law with police and administrative duties, its name and authority are known and respected throughout the land. Its highly developed and richly equipped scientific bureaus have accomplished much for the advancement of knowledge. Its large resources and active personnel, its strategic position at the ear of Congress have enabled it to build up an organization for the administration of law, the prosecution of research, the collection and dissemination of knowledge, and the satisfaction of popular demands, the like of which is unknown in any other country or any other time. Its annual income increases rapidly and now closely approximates that of all the agricultural colleges and experiment stations of the country.

An enterprise so vast, so varied in its elements, so broad in its scope can scarcely fail to evoke criticism as well as praise. Undertaking as it does many of the functions with which our institutions are charged; dealing with the same constituents, and frequently occupying the same field with its projects, it is not surprising that friction sometimes arises between it and the experiment stations. It would seem that in the great field of agricultural education and research, there were abundant room for the operations without clash of interests of both the Department and the land grant colleges. Particularly ought this to be the case since both are public institutions, children of the same parent. There are doubtless legitimate boundaries to the field of each and it is quite probable that these boundaries when established do not overlap. And yet there is frequent complaint from the stations of the tendency of the Department to encroach upon what they regard as their exclusive territory.

The extension work of the Department has greatly increased during the past year and with the popular demand for this service, it is apparently easy for it to increase its resources for this purpose to almost any extent. Bearing in mind what has been said about the early struggles of the colleges and stations to secure the interest and confidence of their constituents and more recently the necessity of holding in check the tendency to exploit the farmers' interest in their work, it is not to be wondered that the colleges and stations are jealous of anything likely to disturb the normal relations between them and their constituents. To me this attitude seems entirely justifiable. These institutions have their legitimate functions in their respective states. To perform these functions most effectively, the sympathetic cooperation and interest of the farmers are needed. These institutions exist solely for public service, but they cannot render this service with the best results to a divided or alienated constituency. The only excuse for any other agency or organization to attempt a similar service would be because of the incompetency of the college or station to do its part. The only conditions consistent with public policy under which another institution or organization could enter the field would be in cooperation with the college or station. One cannot conceive of an outside agency entering the field in any other way unless it were hostile or indifferent to the welfare of the established institutions. For the Department of Agriculture, a child of the same government, to do so is, to say the least, a lamentable lack of coordination in public service. It seems to be a fact that the Department of Agriculture undertakes in the various states, enterprises which naturally belong to the stations; that it sometimes duplicates work of the stations already in progress; that it diverts the attention and interest of the farmer from his own institution; that it needlessly duplicates the work of the stations; that in carrying out its own plans it gives little heed to the plans and purposes of the established colleges and stations; and that its more recent developments in extension work promise to encroach still further upon the work of the extension departments of the colleges.

Over against this is the growing conviction among our institutions that the work of agricultural education, investigation, and extension in the several states should be carried on through their respective state agencies organized for that purpose. If the resources of these institutions are inadequate, or if for any reason it seems best that federal aid should further supplement their work, this should be accomplished always through the agricultural college, the experiment station, or the extension department. If the people of the State are not yet able or ready to provide the necessary means for undertaking all that is desired, there is no surer way to stimulate their efforts and loyalty to their State than by causing them to look to their own institution for relief. On the other hand, for them to constantly receive offers of help from the Department of Agriculture, working independently and without reference to the state institutions, is an effective way of weakening the standing and resources of the latter.

There are boundless fields of effort which the Department of Agriculture cannot exhaust and which our institutions cannot enter. All of the work of interstate policing and supervision is now done by the Department. All general projects for investigations of national rather than local significance; the function of a clearing house between the state institutions; cooperation and collaboration with the state institutions according to their respective needs; these are legitimate, useful and proper functions for a federal Department of Agriculture. But all questions and problems within the State of purely local significance and application should be dealt with by the college or station exclusively. If it is important for the Department to assist in this work, it should invariably operate through and with the state institution. In short, the contact with all local questions of agricultural education, investigation, or extension should be by the state institutions organized for that purpose. The Department of Agriculture should not undertake to deal with the individual farmer. That is the function of the local institution.

Having regard for the future usefulness of the Department and our institutions, as well as for the best interests of agriculture as depending ultimately on a wise system of education, I am convinced that the relations between the Department and the institutions should be speedily defined. It is unwise for the Department to continue its present tendencies. It is unwise for individual institutions to be making all sorts of temporary compromises in this matter. There should be an early conference between the federal authorities and representatives of the colleges and stations to determine a policy governing these relations and I make bold to suggest that these relations should be in the following lines.

The Department should concern itself with national questions. The institutions should concern themselves with state and local matters. Each should as desired cooperate with the other, subordinating itself when entering the other's field.

As I survey the situation, I am impressed with the assurance that with the changing order of things our institutions will always be confronted by peculiar problems which will demand thoughtful foresight and unity of action for their solution. This association has proven its value in shaping policies and securing legislation and its greatest service to our institutions in the future must be along these lines, to unify, crystallize, and put into effect the combined judgment of its members on questions of common interest.

Permit me to conclude my remarks by an expression of my belief that no other course will strengthen our institutions in all relations or ultimately increase their usefulness to the nation to so great a degree, as persistent effort to raise the quality of our teaching and investigation. To accomplish this requires a constant resistance to the encroachments of the popular demands for superficial service. Let that be supplied in its own way, but let there always be cherished a sound core of earnest scientific work and teaching. Let the standards of our colleges be advanced as rapidly as the conditions of our environment will permit. We shall thus do a real public service and most

speedily win our rightful place and recognition in the educational world.

Our institutions should be the leaders in all that pertains to technical, industrial, and vocational education in their respective states, not for the sake of leadership in itself but for the opportunity for larger service. Legislation on these matters, both federal and state, should defer largely to our experience and knowledge of the field and in the administration of new plans, large responsibility should be placed upon our institutions as the logical source and center of all movements for a broader application of education to the life of the people.

We should oppose all schemes for the exploitation of agriculture in the name of science or education and we should insist on a definition and observance of right relations with the Department of Agriculture.

These are large questions, but I have large faith in the plans and purposes of the land grant institutions as they are now being fulfilled and I doubt not they will continue to perform larger and larger service to the Nation and enjoy to a larger degree the support and confidence of the people.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 002 782 687 8

